

21 April 1986

MINUTES OF THE 14 APRIL 1986 SUPPLEMENTAL
TRAFFIC ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

1. The Chairman called the eleventh meeting of the Traffic Advisory Committee (TAC) to order at 2:30 p.m. He stated that the purpose of the meeting was to review detailed engineering roadway and berm design alternatives. These alternatives were developed as a result of issues raised by the Ad Hoc Committee representative at the 29 January 1986 TAC meeting. The Virginia Department of Highways and Transportation (VDH&T) tasked the firm of Dewberry and Davis to develop an expanded set of design alternatives, all based on the conceptual design previously selected. The Chairman stated that as a result of this effort, three roadway and five berm detailed design alternatives had been developed. He stated that the agenda for this meeting would be to review the detailed design alternatives, address the concerns of the McLean Citizens' Association (MCA) and the Ad Hoc Committee and then poll each member present as to the position of their organization regarding the design alternatives.

2. Mr. Maxfield stated that he had some issues to discuss concerning the landscaping around the proposed Visitor's Center. The Chairman stated that that was a separate issue outside the scope of this TAC meeting, but that he would be available after the meeting to discuss the issue.

3. Mr. Maxfield stated that there was an error in the minutes of the 29 January 1986 TAC meeting. Item 6 in the 29 January 1986 TAC minutes, he contends, misstates the facts of the issue. The last issue on page 3 of the Ad Hoc Committee letter to the Chairman of the TAC dated 19 February 1986, is the true position, according to Mr. Maxfield. The Chair opined that it did not agree with Mr. Maxfield's interpretation.

4. Mr. Fowler, of Dewberry and Davis, then presented a brief history of the project. He characterized the project as an at-grade intersection with signalized turn lanes. He also indicated that in the first phase of this roadway improvement project, the environmental assessment conducted by the VDH&T indicated that no mitigating factors were needed for noise abatement. Mr. Maxfield asked whether that information was based on present traffic levels or future traffic levels. Mr. Fowler stated that it was based on worst case (i.e., future) levels which in effect were not significantly higher than the present levels due to limitations on traffic capacity on Rt. 193.

5. Mr Fowler then outlined the design concept of the proposed detailed engineering design. Mr. Maxfield questioned the safety of the bike/pedestrian trail along Route 193. Mr. Gehr stated that the trail design met minimum safety requirements. [] stated that the CIA would include the trail in the roadway improvement project, as requested by the community, and that the VDH&T would design roadway crossings in the safest manner.

STAT

STAT 6. Ms. Adams asked how the power poles would be handled. Mr. Fowler stated that, although that issue would be up to Virginia Power, his opinion was that only one pole would have to be relocated. Mr. Maxfield inquired whether CIA uses power from these poles. [] responded yes.

STAT 7. Mr. Maxfield asked what the level of service is on the present roads. Mr. Fowler stated that levels of service are based on intersections rather than roadways themselves and that, as stated in the original Technical Memorandum No. 1, levels of service varied from D to F. Mr. Maxfield asked why the additional turning lane on Route 193 was needed since the roadway is now at capacity and that there is no substantial increase forecast. Mr. Fowler stated that this issue has been discussed before and has to do with the number of cars per green light cycle. He stated that only dual turn lanes would prevent traffic from backing up. Mr. Pant inquired why we were discussing this issue since it had been previously discussed and resolved. Mr. Maxfield stated he wants to talk about it because the state did not move the Route 193 roadway far enough eastward from the Evermay Section 7. Mr. Pant stated he thought Alternative 2 had already been agreed to and wondered aloud why were we discussing this issue again. He inquired what the next step in the TAC process was. [] responded that the TAC, today, would review the detailed design plans, answer any questions, and ask each TAC representative present to state, for the record, the views of his/her organization regarding the roadway design alternatives presented. This information would then be taken back to the CIA Deputy Director for Administration for his review and decision. His decision would then be communicated to the VDH&T for implementation. Additional TAC reviews would be held at the 60 and 90 percent design completions stages as well.

8. Ms. DuBois asked whether the taper for right turns onto Potomac School Road could be increased. Mr. Fowler stated he would not be able to answer the question until more of the detailed engineering design had been completed.

9. Mr. Fowler then presented roadway design Alternative "A." Mr. Maxfield asked what the safety issues were with this design. Mr. Fowler stated that in his engineering judgement, the curves were too sharp for tandem left-turn lanes. Also, there was an insufficient straight queue leading into the Route 123/193 intersection. Mr. Maxfield inquired whether any such intersections exist in the State of Virginia. Mr. Gehr stated that the VDH&T had inherited some but that VDH&T does not engineer and implement such designs.

10. Mr. Fowler next presented roadway design Alternative "B". He stated that this was a staggered intersection with a very complicated turn arrangement. He stated that this design would cause service to be degraded from level D to level E.

STAT 11. Mr. Fowler then presented the signing plan and various berm designs. One berm design included a preformed masonry barrier. Mr. Maxfield asked whether a brick wall could be provided. [redacted] stated that CIA would only fund a VDH&T standard wall and could not justify spending additional taxpayer dollars on a more expensive, nonstandard wall. Mr. Pant asked whether the walled berm is schematic or based on a noise analysis. Mr. Fowler said that, per the environmental assessment study, no wall at all was required. Mr. Pant stated that Fairfax County would not sign off on this design if the walled berm was called a "noise wall." Mr. Fowler stated that both the wall and berm are only for "screening." Mr. Maxfield stated that the CIA and Government had committed themselves to put up sound and aesthetic screens. The Chair took exception with Mr. Maxfield's statement. Mr. Maxfield stated the Ad Hoc Committee never accepted Alternate 2 because of the berm issue and the Rt. 193 alignment. He stated he wants a berm and aesthetic shield whether a study says it is needed or not. Mr. Fowler described the designed berm heights as varying between 7-1/2 and 10 feet. Mr. Maxfield asked whether there was any analysis done on how to stop noise. Mr. Fowler responded no because there is no requirement to stop noise.

STAT 12. Mr. Fowler presented the landscape plan. Mr. Maxfield asked what the shaded area near the Turkey Run intersection is. Mr. Fowler stated it was a berm running from zero elevation to about an 8 foot elevation. Mr. Maxfield asked whether Mr. Fowler could compare the berm elevations to elevations of a few of the Evermay Section 7 residential back yards along Rt. 193. Mr. Fowler stated the berm would always be at a higher elevation than the backyards but in some cases almost close to zero as the berm tapers off. Mr. Maxfield said his real question was how high a berm could be provided. Mr. Fowler stated that for a berm any higher than proposed, the necessary slope may intrude up to 18 feet into some of the Evermay Section 7 residential backyards. Delegate Andrews asked whether this would create a drainage problem. Mr. Fowler said there would almost certainly be some problems. [redacted] asked whether Mr. Maxfield had authorization to speak on behalf of the homeowners with respect to utilizing private property for a public roadway project. Mr. Maxfield stated he had the authority to speak for all residents.

STAT 13. [redacted] then addressed issues from the 29 January TAC meeting. He stated that in light of community concerns, the state has agreed to place a traffic light at Savile Lane as a part of the Route 123 roadway improvement program. He also stated that in response to an inquiry from the Ad Hoc committee that the CIA would request \$500,000 in FY 88 funds from the Congress for an enhanced exit ramp off Route 495 northbound, on to the George Washington Memorial Parkway. These funds would be transferred to VDH&T for implementation. Mr. Maxfield stated that the former DDA indicated that this work would be accomplished within one year. Mr. Gehr stated that, per the last TAC meeting, work would

STAT start in 1988 and be completed in 1-1/2 to 2 years. Mr. Maxfield asked whether the work could be done in one year. Mr. Gehr said he could not answer that question. Mr. Maxfield asked if the CIA would work with the VDH&T to complete the project in one year. [] stated that the CIA would transfer funds to the VDH&T to have the project implemented in accordance with normal VDH&T procedures. Mr. Maxfield requested that the record reflect that his position is that the former DDA stated that the exit lane would be provided within 12 months.

STAT 14. [] addressed a request by the Ad Hoc Committee to look into the possibility of acquiring approximately 15 feet of right-of-way from the City of Falls Church Water Authority so that the Potomac School Road immediately south of Route 123 could be realigned to line up with the offset intersection outlined in design Alternative B. [] stated that CIA had explored the issue with both the City of Falls Church and Fairfax County Water Authorities and with the VDH&T and would not attempt to acquire the right-of-way since it entailed substantial additional costs and, regardless, was unequivocally outside the scope of this project.

STAT 15. [] then opened the floor for questions. Mr. Maxfield stated that the Ad Hoc Committee is trying to achieve better sight and sound protection for residents of Section 7 of the Evermay community. He stated that this could be achieved by increasing the berm height, moving Rt. 193 between Turkey Run Farm Road and Route 123 further east, or cutting down the number of turn lanes onto Route 123. He further stated that if traffic on Route 193 does not substantially increase, the lanes could be reduced depending on the green time of the traffic signal. He asked what the green time was. Mr. Fowler stated that the information is available but that he did not have it with him. Mr. Sabin stated that traffic would increase 15 per cent. Mr. Gehr stated that traffic would increase by 122 cars over a 22-year period. Mr. Fowler said that this increase would not be due to CIA traffic but would be generated by other growth factors in the community. Mr. Pant stated that maybe we don't want to do anything. Mr. Maxfield responded that the Ad Hoc Committee argued just that in the early days of this project. He stated that based on his experience, traffic flows at the rate of about 10 cars per minute now and will flow at the same rate in the future.

STAT 16. At the conclusion of this discussion, the Chairman asked each member to comment on the acceptability of the proposed design. He stated that the CIA position is that the proposed design is the only one of the three that meets VDH&T requirements for safety and effective traffic handling. Mr. Maxfield stated that the CIA agreed to look at all reasonable alternatives. The Chairman responded affirmatively but stated that did not include a commitment to move the Route 193 roadway. Ms. Adams asked whether the road was as far east as possible. [] replied that, in the judgment of the VDH&T, it was as far east as it could be sited.

STAT 17. [] stated that, since August 1983, some 40 community issues and concerns had been identified through the TAC process and that with the exception of one, each had been resolved to the satisfaction of the community. He stated the CIA has been and will continue to be a good neighbor and that good and honorable neighbors can have, from time to time, honest differences. He stated that in order for the Route 123 roadway improvement project to be completed in 1987, the detailed engineering design had to proceed now. [] added that the community on more than one occasion had asked that the Agency not occupy the New Headquarters Building until the Route 123 roadway improvement project had been completed, and that the Agency's current planning, which is consistent with Mr. Fitzwater's 15 July 1983 letter, can only be accomplished if the detailed engineering design is reinitiated now. Mr. [] further made reference to his written point-paper response to the Ad Hoc Committee concern on this issue. With that, the Chairman polled the members of the TAC for positions regarding the roadway design alternatives.

a. Fairfax County (Mr. Pant) supported the proposed design.

STAT b. National Capital Planning Commission (NCPC) - Mr. Gresham stated that while the Commission has not met on this issue yet, the NCPC Staff had only a single concern--that regarding the disposition of land south of the Scattergood-Thorne tract. [] stated that the CIA had a letter from the VDH&T stating that the land would be kept in the State inventory as open space, in perpetuity. Mr. Gresham had no other concerns with issues presented.

c. McLean Citizens' Association - Mr. Sabin stated that the MCA supported the proposed design.

d. AD Hoc Committee - Mr. Maxfield stated that the Ad Hoc Committee agreed to Alternative 2 with the provision that Everymay Section 7 be protected by moving Rt. 193 east 40 feet and protected by adequate berming. He stated that the committee would not have supported Alternative 2 if it knew that these issues would not be adequately addressed. He stated that his position was threefold. One, the Rt. 193 intersection should be moved 40 feet further east. Second, if the roadway cannot be moved, the dual turn lanes should be reduced to a single turn lane. Third, what would it take to increase the berm height to 15 feet. He stated he would discuss with affected homeowners the issue of taking up to perhaps 18 feet of their backyards to accommodate this.

e. VDH&T - (Mr. Conley) supported Alternative 2 as presented.

18. The following observers to the TAC process were also polled:

a. Ms. Joan DuBois, representing Fairfax County Supervisor Nancy Falck, supported the proposed design.

b. Mr. Mike Carlin, representing Congressman Frank Wolf (R, VA), stated that, like the CIA, Congressman Wolf would rely on the VDH&T traffic experts and supports the proposed design.

19. The Chairman thanked all present for their participation and adjourned the meeting at 4:25 PM.

Attachment: List of Attendees

CIA SPECIAL TAC MEETING
14 APRIL 1986

ATTENDEESORGANIZATIONPHONE

STAT

	Chairman, CIA	
David R. Gehr	VDH&T, No. VA District	359-1160
Roy Conley	VDH&T, Richmond	786-2551
Bob Gresham	NCPC	724-0176
Robert E. Griffith	Clearview Manor	356-5689
Gloria Adams	MCA	790-1990
Arthur C. Sabin	MCA	790-5440
Charles D. Long	VDH&T C.O.	786-5869
Shiva K. Pant	Fairfax County	691-3311
Kent A. Maxfield	Ad Hoc Committee	769-5500
Robert T. Andrews	Va. General Assembly	442-8835
Joan DuBois	Supervisor Falck's Office	356-0551
Michael Carlin	Congressman Wolf	225-5136